REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-26 are pending in the referenced application. Claims 1, 9, and 18 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or directly, from claims 1, 9, and 18.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 5,535,329 ("Hastings") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,675 ("Herbig"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

MPEP § 2143 states that "[t]he key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in KSR noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit." Further, when combining prior art elements, the Examiner "must articulate the following: (1) a finding that the prior art included each element claimed, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference, with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference…." MPEP § 2143(A).

Turning to the rejection, the Applicant asserts that Hastings does not teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 1 and that Herbig does not teach, suggest or render obviousness,

that which Hastings fails to teach or suggest. Specifically, the Examiner has relied on Hastings to disclose:(i) "a relation that includes dummy arguments associated with the generic function call"; (ii) using the relation to determine whether the generic function call includes errors; and (iii) using the relation to determine a failure mode for the generic function call. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner for at least the reasons discussed below.

(i) "a relation that includes dummy arguments associated with the generic function call" – The Examiner has attempted to equate "dummy entries in" with "dummy arguments." This Applicant disagrees. First, an "argument" in a function call is not equivalent to adding data (*i.e.,* dummy entries) to an array (*see* Hasting, co. 12, ll. 45-62). Second, when the above limitation is viewed as a whole, the limitation requires a relation of dummy arguments (*i.e.,* an argument signature) for the generic function call. *See e.g.,* Original Specification, p. 7. For example, referring to Figure 1 of the Original Specification, if the generic function is "SUM" , then the relation of dummy arguments for the generic function may be any one of the rows (n_1-n_{14}) in Figure 1(a).

In view of the above, it is clear that (a) dummy arguments are clearly not equivalent to dummy entries and (b) the teachings in Hastings of the insertion of dummy entries into an array is not equivalent to a relation of dummy arguments for a generic function call.

(ii) using the relation to determine whether the generic function call includes errors – As discussed above, the relation of dummy arguments corresponds to an argument signature for the generic function call. Based on this, it is clear that merely inserting data in an array as taught by Hastings is not equivalent to using an argument signature (*i.e.,* the relation) to determine the presence of an error in a generic function call.

(iii) using the relation to determine a failure mode for the generic function call - As discussed above, the relation of dummy arguments corresponds to an argument signature for the generic function call. From this it logically follows that because Hastings does not teach or suggest the relation of dummy arguments Hastings can not teach or suggest using an argument signature to determine a failure mode (*i.e.,* the reason for the error in the generic function call) using the relation of the dummy arguments.

Further, Herbig fails to disclose that which Hastings lacks as evidenced by the fact that Herbig is only relied upon to teach generic function calls. *See* Office Action mailed February 21, 2008.

In view of the above, independent claim 1 is patentable over Hastings and Herbig. Independent claims 9 and 18 include at least the above patentable limitations and, thus, are patentable over Hastings and Herbig for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1. Dependent claims are patentable over Hastings and Herbig for at least the same reasons as the aforementioned independent claims.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 33227/150001)

Dated: May 21, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/

Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant